

grant. J. A. S. B. Vol. X, p. 100, where it has been translated into “ which extends as far as *Trinayuthi*.” (p. 103).

(16.) This is the usual reservation about previous endowments. Compare पूर्वप्रदत्तदेवदायब्रह्मदायरहितो in J. A. S. B. Vol. VIII, p. 298. देवब्राह्मण-भुक्तिवर्जम् Vol. V, p. 379.

(17.) Compare आज्ञाविधेयैर्भूत्वा in J. A. S. B. Vol. V, p. 379. आज्ञाविधेयीभ्य in J. A. S. B. Vol. X, p. 100.

(18.) Compare यथा दीयमानभागभोगकरहिरण्यादिकं. J. A. S. B. Vol. V, p. 379, which is translated into “ the full usufruct of all the rights and dues heretofore paid to Government,” (p. 382). Also यथादीयमानकरकर-पूरनिकप्रभृतिनियतानियतसमस्त in J. A. S. B. Vol. X, p. 100 which is generally translated at p. 103 into “ its revenues, as settled, or are to be settled.”

(19.) Compare अचन्द्रादित्यकालीयः &c. in J. A. S. B. Vol. V, p. 729. सचन्द्रार्काणवसरित्यर्वतसमकालीनः &c. in J. A. S. B. Vol. VIII, p. 298.

(20.) This *sloka* occurs amongst others in J. A. S. B. Vol. V, p. 379. Vol. VIII, pp. 298, 493. Vol. X, p. 100.

(21.) J. A. S. B. Vol. VIII, p. 494. Vol. X, p. 100.

(22.) Compare J. A. S. B. Vol. VIII, p. 494 where धराश्चा is a mistake for वराश्चाः, and Vol. X, p. 100.

(23.) J. A. S. B. Vol. V, p. 379. Vol. VIII, p. 493. Vol. X, p. 100. In *Pravara Sena's* copper-plate grant the latter half of the *slok* is different :

खदत्ताम्परदत्तां वा यो हरेत् वसुधराम् ।

गवां शतसहस्रस्य हन्तुर्हरति दुष्कृतमिति ॥ J. A. S. B. Vol. V, p. 729.

(24.) In this *sloka* सुवर्णं should be substituted for the sake of the metre for स्वर्णं. Compare J. A. S. B. Vol. VIII, p. 493.

(25.) The words in the original सुहवास समावाये seem distinct enough, but I am unable to attach any meaning to the compound.

~~~~~

*The Antiquities of Bagurá (Bogra).—By H. BEVERIDGE, C. S.*

Though Bagurá is almost a by-word among the Officers of Government for seclusion and dulness, yet like most places in this world it has attractions which only require unveiling. Perhaps to most Anglo-Indians, Bagurá is chiefly interesting, because it was the residence of Sir George Yule and the scene of many of his tiger-slaying exploits, but in reality the district has claims to attention of another and more enduring order. Foremost among these is the circumstance that it occupies an important place in the legendary and historical annals of Bengal. It is traversed from north to south by the sacred Karatoyá, which divides it into two nearly equal portions. This river has now dwindled into an insignificant stream, easily fordable in the cold weather and scarcely navigable except

in the height of the rains. But in old times, it was a great river, and formed the boundary between Bengal and Kám-rúp. The western bank has apparently undergone little change. The old rampart, known as Bhím-jangal, still runs alongside of the western bank, and the ancient mound and fortification of Mahásthán continues to overhang the sacred bathing-place at Síla-dwíp; but on the east the appearance of the country has been greatly changed. The old river-bed has been nearly filled up, and long and wide churs, “made blithe by plough and harrow”, now cover the channel up which the ships of the famous Chánd Saudágar used to sail.

Though no longer a territorial boundary, the Karatoyá is still remarkable for the demarcation which it makes between two distinct kinds of soil. On the west, Bagurá is a veritable land of Edom, the soil being almost as red as blood. It is at the same time so hard and tenacious, that ditches cut in it retain their sharpness of outline for years, and that the walls of the peasants' huts are almost invariably made of earth. The ant-hills so common on the edges of the fields testify to the peculiarity of the soil, for they stand up in sharp and many-pointed pinnacles and are like Adens in miniature. On the east of the Karatoyá, however, all is sand and alluvium, and the ryots have to construct the walls of their houses with reeds or mats. This difference of soil is said to affect the crime of the district; for burglaries are reported to be rare in the western thánás, as it is no easy matter for thieves to break through and steal, when the walls of the houses are so thick and hard as they are in the “Khiar” land. The etymology of the word Karatoyá is indicative of the antiquity and sanctity of the river. The name is derived from *kar* ‘the hand’ and *toyá* ‘water’, and is held to signify that the river was formed by the water which was poured on the hands of Siva, when he married the mountain-goddess Párvati.

I find also that there is the same tradition in Bagurá as in Maimansingh about the origin of the name Das-kahániá as applied to Sherpur. The Bagurá Sherpur is called Das-kahániá as well as the Maimansingh Sherpur, and the explanation given is, that the Karatoyá was once so broad that ten káhans had to be paid for crossing it. The explanation, however, does not seem a very probable one, for ten káhans means 12,800 kaurís, *i. e.*, one rupee, and I can hardly believe that any Bengali ever paid so much for crossing a river. It is just possible that the charge had reference not to the breadth of the river but to the fact that it separated two rival kingdoms. The charge may therefore have been in the nature of an embargo or an export-duty, and went for the most part into the pocket of the king or his representative, and not to the ferryman. It would be quite in accordance with the principles of native finance to levy such exorbitant duties on people leaving the country or taking merchandise abroad.



By the Hindus Bagurá is popularly identified with the country of king Virat, where the five Pándavas remained hidden for a year. Bagurá, they tell us, was the Dakshina Go-grih or southern cow-house (*Scotticè* byre) of king Virat, the northern one being in Ghorághát, *i. e.*, Aswasála. Bhím, they say, disguised himself as Virat's herdsman, and built the rampart known as Bhím's Jangal to make a pen for the cattle. So say the Pañdits, while the ryots improve the evidence got from this by pointing to the stone-pillar in the Badalgáchhi tháná and calling it Bhím's *pánti*, *i. e.*, Bhím's ox-goad. Additional corroboration is sought from the fact that there are villages in Bagurá, known by the names of Virat and Kichak (Virat's brother-in-law). Unfortunately, however, names of places are more likely to be the offspring of traditions than to be evidence of their genuineness, and even if the village of Kichak be old, it more probably derives its name from the wandering gypsies and robbers of the last century who were called Kichaks, than from the villain of the Mahábhárat.

A more convincing indication of the antiquity of Bagurá was obtained only last year when a tank was being dug in the middle of the town. The tank had been excavated to a considerable depth, when the workmen came on the top of a brick well. The well is still standing in the tank and may be seen by the curious. It is circular in form and solidly built with large, thin bricks which are so broad in proportion to their length as to be nearly square. The mode of building seems peculiar, for the bricks are arranged in layers which are alternately composed of flat and perpendicular bricks. The top now visible appears to me to be the real top of the well, and it is some fifteen feet below the present surface of the country. The remarkable thing is that the earth is not sand or chur-earth, but is solid, red soil. How the well came to be where it is, I cannot explain; but if the fifteen feet of earth were really gradually deposited above it, then the well must be many centuries old. Close to this tank, and only separated by the public road, there is an interesting proof of the antiquity of the soil in a magnificent Banyan tree. It is, I think, the finest tree I have seen next to that in the Botanical Gardens at Calcutta, and it is much more attractive than the latter, because it is still in the heyday of its career of beneficence. The Bagurá market is held under it and twice a week hundreds of men and cattle are sheltered by it from the sun and rain.

The real glory of Bagurá perhaps is the Badalgáchhi pillar which bears an inscription of the Pál Rájás, and which has been described by Sir Charles Wilkins and more recently by a native gentleman. I have never seen this pillar, and I hear that it is now so shrouded in jungle as to be almost inaccessible. As it is situated in the Government Estate of Jaipur, it is to be hoped that the authorities will look after its preservation. It is locally known as Bhím's *pánti* or ox-goad.

The most widely-known antiquity in Bagurá is Mahásthán, or the Great Place, which is situated seven miles north of the Civil Station. Mahásthán probably originally owed its importance to its being near a sacred bathing-place, and hence some have with a perverse ingenuity suggested that the true name is Mahásnán. Afterwards it became the habitation of a Kshatriya prince named Parasurám. Some traditions identify him with Parasuráma the destroyer of the Kshatriyas, though to do this, it is necessary to change his caste and make him a Bráhman. He was defeated and slain by a Muhammadan, named Muhammad Sháh Sultán, and probably it is this circumstance which has done most to perpetuate his fame. Muhammad Sháh Sultán is buried at Mahásthán, and his tomb is annually visited by thousands of pilgrims. There is no inscription on the tomb, and no one seems to know exactly who he was or where he came from. He bears the title of Máhi-suwár or fish-rider, and Hindus who swallow their own traditions wholesale, think they must rationalize this epithet by referring it to the figure head of the ship which brought the faqír. It is hardly worth while to do this when there are so many more marvels connected with him. The name Máhi-suwár probably has its origin in invention, pure and simple.

The only genuine inference which we can make, I think, from Muhammad Sháh's history is, that he was the hero of a popular rising. He was not a fighting man apparently, and is never called a Ghází, like the famous Ismá'íl of Rangpúr. Parasurám was probably a bigoted tyrant, and was killed by those of his subjects who had turned Muhammadans. This view is supported by the local tradition that Parasurám could not bear the sight of a Musalmán. It seems also certain that Muhammad Sháh was helped by Parasurám's own subjects; for the tradition is, that one Harpál, the Rájá's sweeper, used to convey information to Muhammad Sháh of what was going on inside the palace. The sweeper's tomb is still pointed out on the mound of Mahásthán, and until Muhammadans got more puritanical, they used to make offerings at it of *sharáb* and *kabáb*, *i. e.*, meat and wine. Muhammad Sháh's tomb is in good preservation and is lighted up every night. It is surrounded by a wall, and close to the doorway there is a large stone Gauripát (not a lingam) lying on the ground. Mr. O'Donnell has described Mahásthán in the Asiatic Society's Journal for 1875, Part I, No. 2, but there are some errors in his account. As far as I can learn, the legend of the beautiful Síla Deví has its origin in a mispronunciation. The original name of the place is Síladwíp, *i. e.*, the mound of stones, 'dwíp' in Bagurá being used to mean any high place and the epithet *Síla* being applied to this one on account of the large stones lying about on it. The populace, however, have lost sight of this meaning, and so started the tradition of Síla Deví. There is no flight of stairs at Síla Deví's Ghát, only



two old trees. The sacred part of the river extends over  $2\frac{1}{2}$  reaches or about two miles, from Skand (a name of Siva) ghát to Gobindghát in the village of Gokul. The place called Síla Devi's ghát lies about half-way between the above gháts. An annual fair is held in the month of Chait, but the most sacred time is when the conjunction of the planets admits of the bathing's taking place in the month of Pús (Pús Náráyani).

Mr. O'Donnell speaks of the grant for the lákhiráj of Mahásthán having been confirmed in 1666 by the Governor of Dháká. In fact, however, the confirmation is dated 7th Jumáda I, 1096, A. H. (1st April, 1685) in the thirtieth year of the reign. I have seen the original *sanad*, which is in the Record-room at Bogra. The deed bears the seal of Kokultásh Muzaffar-Jang [Husain]. It is in the form of an order addressed to the officials of Silbaris in Sirkár Bázúhá, and directs them to respect the lákhiráj of the saint Muhammad Sultán Mahí-suwár's Ástán. The word 'ástán' suggests to me the idea that Mahásthán may after all be a Muhammadan name meaning the Great Ástán. The Hindu name perhaps was Síladwíp. The place is also often called Mastángarh and under this name it appears in the Survey Map. I send a copy of the *Sanad* along with these remarks.\* With regard to the resumption-proceedings, noted

\* The following is a transcript of the copy of the *Sanad*—

\* میر سید سلطان محمود ماہی سوار \*

مقرر شد کہ متصدیان مہمات حال واستقبال و چودھریان و قانون گویان  
پرگنہ سیلابرس سرکار بازوہا بدانند چون بعرض رسید کہ بموجب فرمان والاشان  
واسناد حکام سابق خادمی آستانہ مقدسہ سلطان العارفین حضرت . . . . و خارج  
جمع مستان گتہ و زمین در پیچ ندی مشمولہ پرگنہ مذکور بسید محمد طاہر و سید  
عبد الرحمان و سید محمد رضا با فرزندان بلا مشارکت غیرے مقرر است می باید کہ  
مشارالہم را خادم روضہ مذورہ دانستہ مستان گتہ و اراضی مسطور را بمومی الہم  
وا گذارند کہ در ورثہ خودہا رسیدہ نزر و نیاز آستانہ مقدسہ و واصلات آنرا خرچ  
خانقاہ واردان و صادران و صرف معشیت خودہا نمودہ بدعاگوئیء دوام دولت  
اشتغال میداشتہ باشند \* درین باب قدغن دانند \* تحریر بتاریخ ۷ شہر جمادی الاول  
سنہ ۳۰ جلوس مطابق سنہ ۱۰۹۶ ہجری قلمی شد فقط \*

پادشاہ

عالم گیر غازی

کوکلتاس

مظفر جنگ بہادر

by Mr. O'Donnell, I must in justice to our Government observe that no attempt was made to resume the whole tenure. All the land within the garh or fortification (some thousands of bíghas apparently) was admitted to belong to the lákhirájdárs. The dispute was only about 300 bíghas of chur-land which had formed between Mahásthán proper and the river-channel. The resumption-proceedings, however, must have been rather harassing to the proprietors; for they began in 1824, and did not end till December 1843. Síla Deví's Ghát is in this chur which was sought to be resumed, and this perhaps is enough to show the baselessness of the story about her, for clearly the chur was formed long after Mahásthán was made.

---

*Translation.*

It has been ordered that the Mutasaddís of all present and future matters of government, and the Chaudhurís, and Kánúngos of Pargana Sílbaris in Sirkár Bázúhá should bear in mind that, inasmuch as it has come to the knowledge of government that according to the *farmáns* and *sanads*, granted by former rulers, the service of the sacred shrine of the king of saints, Hazrat.....and income of Mastángarh and the land comprised within the bend of the river, in the said Pargana, have been settled on Sayyid Muhammad Táhír and on Sayyid 'Abdur-rahmán and on Sayyid Muhammad Razá and on their children, without anyone else being a partner, it is necessary that the above-mentioned persons should be looked upon as the servitors of the illuminated shrine, and that they should be left in possession of Mastángarh and of the above described lands, so that the lands may go down to their heirs; that they may perform the vows and prayers as usual at this holy shrine; that they may apply the income to defraying the expenditure of the religious house, on travellers, and on themselves for their own livelihood, so that they may occupy themselves with loyal prayers for the continuance of the present government. Every care is to be taken in this matter.

Written on the 7th Jumáda I, of the 30th year of the present reign, corresponding to the year of the Hijra 1096.

(Signed) Muzaffar Jang Bahádur, foster-brother (*kokultásh*) of 'Alamgír Pádsháh-i-Ghází.

It is impossible to reconcile the particulars given in the sanad copy with historical facts. *First*, the name should be Muzaffar *Husain* not Muzaffar *Jang*. It is possible that the copyist mistook حسین for جنگ. *Secondly*, Muzaffar Husain Kokultásh (also called Fidái Khán A'zam Kokah, *kokah* being the same as *kokultásh*) was governor of Bengal from the middle of 1088 H., [A. D. 1677] *i. e.*, the 20th year of 'Alamgír, to the 9th (or 12th) Rabí' II, 1089 (*i. e.*, the 21st year of 'Alamgír), when he died at Dháká.

But the 7th Jumáda I, 1096 [1685, A. D.] falls in the 28th year of 'Alamgír, whose 30th year commences with the 1st Ramazán 1097 [A. D. 1685].

The name of the saint is written at the top instead of in its proper place in the body of the deed, in order to do him honor. This is in accordance with Hindu customs, as may be seen in *sanads* for lands dedicated to an idol.



I could find nothing Buddhist at Mahásthán, and my impression is that Messrs. Westmacott and O'Donnell have been somewhat too ready to believe that Buddhism once prevailed in Bagurá. Bardankúṭí is a comparatively recent place, and has nothing to do, I think, with the Pandra Varddhana of the Chinese pilgrim. There are two statues at Mahásthán. One appears to be Basudeb (Krishna), and the other is simply a mermaid. It has no theological signification at all, I think, and is just a fantastic figure such as are common in Hindu palaces. The "right hand clenched," referred to by Mr. O'Donnell is, I think, a foot.

One curious remain at Mahásthán is a large brick well with rude stone steps leading down it. The steps are simply large stones jutting out from the brick work and look very awkward things to descend by. However I was told that many persons go down by them at the time of the fair. The well is called the Jiyat-kund, or well of life, and the tradition is, that Parasurám for a long time got the better of Sháh Sultán, because when any Hindu soldier was killed, Parasurám revived him by sprinkling water from this well over him. The sweeper Harpál told Sháh Sultán of this, and then he destroyed the efficacy of the water by throwing pieces of beef into it. The fortification of Mahásthán is quadrangular in shape, and is popularly said to be two miles square. There are four openings in it, and these are pointed out as the gates. One is called the Támár Darwázah, because it is said to have been sheathed with copper. Outside the rampart there is on one side a large lake, called the Kálidohá Ságar. There are islands in it, and a promontory on its banks is called Bish-Mathan, because it is said that on it the goddesses Lutta and Padya mixed the poison which destroyed Chánd Saudágar's family. Chánd Saudágar is, as is well known, the impious merchant who would not worship Manesha, or the Lady of the Snakes. He is said to have lived at Chándmoa, *i. e.*, Chándmukh, near Mahásthán, and the foundations of the house he built for his son are still pointed out.

Another antiquity in Bagurá, the importance of which, however, is a good deal exaggerated by the people, is Jogir Bhaban, or the Ascetic's house. It lies some seven miles west of Bagurá. It appears to have been an early settlement of the Gosáins, or followers of Siva. The remains consist of some temples with elaborately carved wooden doors. One temple has the Bengali date 1089, and the name Meher Náth Sadak. One of the doors has the date 1119, and the name of Shukhal Náth Gosáin. There is one curious tomb with three monuments of different sizes. The largest is the guru's, the second is the disciple's, and the third and smallest is said to be that of the guru's dog ("his faithful dog shall bear him company"). There is a well of life here, too, but it is quadrangular in shape. The jogí in charge of the temples gave me a curious instance of faith. There are several images inside one temple, and the jogí candidly said that he

could not tell what god one of them represented. However, he said, as it was in the temple he accepted it and worshipped the unknown god. To the west of Jogir Bhaban, there are said to be the remains of the house of the Rájá Salbon (Sáliváhan?) and to the north of it, the remains of the house of the Rájá Srí Náth. Perhaps they were ancestors of Parasurám.

Returning to Mahásthán, I have to say that Parasurám was evidently a devoted worshipper of Siva. Indeed, he seems to have meditated setting up a rival to Banáras. In and about Mahásthán, there are places called Káshí, Brindában, and Mathurá.

In 1862, or thereabouts, a number of gold coins were found at Bámanpára, near Mahásthán. The most of them have disappeared, but I have seen two, and have sent them to the Asiatic Society for identification. The records of the case which is said to have taken place about them have been destroyed. In 1874, a pot of old rupees was found in the village of Mahásthán by a labourer who was digging a ditch in a pân garden. The owners of the pân garden wrested the coins from him, and were convicted, rather harshly I think, of robbery and sentenced to six months' imprisonment. On appeal, their sentence was reduced to three months. Some of the coins were bought from the owners by Major Hume and were afterwards sent to the Asiatic Society. One coin was lying in the Magistrate's Málkhána, and has been sent by me to Professor H. Blochmann.\* I have also sent down two other silver coins which are said to have been found at Mahásthán.

\* The silver coins were described in Journal, Asiatic Society, Bengal, Part I, for 1875, p. 288. The coins now sent are five in number, *viz.*, 2 gold coins, regarding which Dr. Rájendralála Mitra says:—"One of them, with the lion on the reverse, belongs to Mahendra Gupta, or as given on the margin of the obverse, Sri Mahendra Siñha; and the other to Chandra Gupta. Both have been figured in Thomas's Prinsep. The princes belong to the 2nd and 3rd centuries of the Christian era."

The three silver coins are—(1) a silver *tánkah* of Shams-uddín Ilyás Sháh of Bengal, as published by Thomas in his 'Initial Coinage of Bengal.'

(2.) A silver *tánkah*, struck in 862 H., by Mahmúd Sháh I, of Bengal as figured in this Journal, for 1875, Pl. XI, No. 7. The reverse is the same as in Nos. 5 and 8, but the reading is still doubtful.

(3.) A silver *tánkah* by the same king, of coarse manufacture, similar to Nos. 2 and 3, of Pl. XI, *loc. cit.*

